

## REMARKS

In an Office Action dated January 18, 2005, the Examiner objected to the Specification as not referring to trademarks properly. The Examiner also stated that the term "an adhesive thermoplastic laminate" cannot be understood from the context of the application. Applicant has proposed a new paragraph for the first paragraph on page 7 according to the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification is in proper form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable the claims for the non-reactive silicone microcapsules. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 18 to indicate that the silicone in the microcapsules is formable. Support for this amendment is found on Page 2, line 25 to Page 3, line 22 of the Specification. In light of the amendment, the applicants respectfully request that for claims 1, 10 and 18 the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 4-9, 11-17 and 19-21 should also be withdrawn as they depend on amended claims 1, 10 and 18.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-8 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 5-8 and 10-17 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. In light of these amendments, the applicants respectfully request that for claims 5-8 and 10-17 the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant acknowledges that the claims 2 and 3 contain allowable subject matter. These claims remain allowable in light of the amendment made to claim 1.

The Examiner states that non-patent documents listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 10, 2003 were not considered because the Examiner did not have copies of the cited-references. Enclosed herewith is a PTOL 1449 with the documents and showing dates of publication for consideration by the Examiner and so that the documents will be made of record.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the specification pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alberto Cavallaro, et al.

By: Simon B Anolick

Simon B. Anolick  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,585  
Phone No.: 847/576-4234  
Fax No.: 847/576-3750